

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the abstract, specification and claim 1 has been amended. Claims 4 and 7-9 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 are pending and under consideration.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Applicants extend their thanks to the Examiner for the courtesy shown to their representative during the telephone interview held on May 13, 2009.

In the interview the Examiner noted that the use of the term "unhardened steel" could properly define "raw steel."

Further, the Examiner noted that the Applicants' proposed claim amendment clarifying that the inner surface of the other annular collar is left as unhardened steel so as to be formed by bending and is also left as unhardened steel thereafter should overcome the relied upon prior art.

As shown above and below, the changes discussed in the interview have been incorporated into the present amendment.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to because of the use of the term "raw steel." The term "raw steel" has been replaced by the term "unhardened steel" in the specification.

Withdrawal of the foregoing objection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 112

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the use of the term "raw steel" in claim 1 rendered the claim unclear. The term "raw steel" has been replaced by the term "unhardened steel" in claim 1.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 103

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. (US 5,848,846) (hereinafter “Sugiyama”) in view of Lewis (US 2,383,727) (hereinafter “Lewis”) and Takemura et al. (US 6,332,714) (hereinafter “Takemura”).

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6

Amended claim 1 recites: “...an inner surface of the other annular collar is left as unhardened steel so as to be formed by bending and is also left as unhardened steel thereafter.”

In the Office Action, in the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner noted that claim 1 recited that the inner surface of the other annular collar is left as raw (unhardened) steel so as to be formed by bending, but that claim 1 did not go beyond bending and does not recite the property of the steel after bending. As shown above, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that an inner surface of the other annular collar is left as unhardened steel so as to be formed by bending and is also left as unhardened steel thereafter.

As noted in the Office Action, neither Sugiyama nor Takemura discusses that an inner surface of the other annular collar is left as raw steel. Instead, the Office Action relies on Lewis to show this feature of claim 1 and particularly relies on 2:30:2:41 of Lewis.

2:30-2:41 of Lewis discusses that it is preferable to accomplish the primary bending of the thin lip 11 before heat treatment. However, 2:42-2:45 of Lewis clearly discloses that the cup 10 and thin lip 11 are heat treated after bending.

Claim 1 recites that an inner surface of the other annular collar is left as unhardened steel **and is also left as unhardened steel thereafter**. Lewis discloses an antifriction bearing where the cup 10 and thin lip 11 are heat treated. More specifically, the finished product of Lewis includes a cup 10 and thin lip 11 that are heat treated. Claim 1 recites a roller bearing assembly where the inner surface of one of the annular collars is left as unhardened steel.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references relied on by the Examiner discuss a roller bearing assembly where the inner surface of one of the annular collars is unhardened steel, or not subjected to some form of hardness treatment.

This technical feature of claim 1 provides for a roller bearing assembly having a greater product quality and also reduces the stock of work in process.

Claims 3, 5 and 6 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 27, 2009

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501